REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15-21 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 10 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 18-21 have been added; however, no additional claims fees are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fredericks et al., U. S. Patent 4,939,735 (Fredericks).

Applicant respectfully traverses. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, "anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Emphasis added.

Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 4, 9 and 13 recite elements which have not been disclosed, taught or suggested by Fredericks. For example, claims 1, 4, 9 and generally recite implementing at least two interconnect protocol definitions, the at least two interconnect protocol definitions including a single-thread, multiple-speed protocol method and a multiple-thread, single-speed protocol method. Frederick fails to teach, disclose or suggest implementing at least two interconnect protocol definitions, the at least two interconnect protocol definitions including a single-thread, multiple-speed protocol method and a multiple-thread, single-speed protocol method.

The Patent Office cites Fig. 2 and Column 6, Lines 40-48 for support of its assertion that Fredericks discloses implementing at least two interconnect protocol definitions, the at least two interconnect protocol definitions including a single-thread,

multiple-speed protocol method and a multiple-thread, single-speed protocol method. Fig. 2 and this passage only disclose a serializer and deserializer. A serializer and deserializer only disclose the conversion of a serial data to parallel data and conversion of parallel data to serial data. Fredericks fails to teach, disclose or suggest implementing a multiple-speed protocol which may operate at different data rates. Emphasis added. Rather, the system of Fredericks is only operable at a single speed contrary to the recited elements of claims 1, 4, 9 and 13. A search of the entire disclosure of Fredericks found no mention of the ability to operate according to different speeds or different data rates. Consequently, under *Lindemann*, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established for claims 1, 4, 9 and 13. Claims 3, 6-8, 11, 12 and 15-21 are believed allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Patent Office rejected claims 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredericks et al., U. S. Patent 4,939,735 (Fredericks) in view of Yoshida, U. S. Patent 6,052,820 (Yoshida).

It is contended that all of the claims rejected under this section depend on independent claims 1 and 9, both of which are non-anticipatory and non-obvious based on the rationale above. Thus, dependent claim 7 (which depends on independent claim 1) and dependent claim 12 (which depends on independent claim 9) should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing amendments, reconsideration of the claims is hereby requested, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LSI Logic, Inc.

Dated: October 5, 2005

Attorney for Applicant Chad W. Swantz

Reg. No. 46,329

Chad W. Swantz Suiter West pc llo 14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220 Omaha, Nebraska 68154 Telephone 402.496.0300 Facsimile 402.496.0333